

**REMARKS**

Independent claims 18 and 25 have been amended.

Claims 18-20, 24-27, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankoff (US Publ. 2002/0116271) in view of Cronic (US Pat. 7,032,240) and further in view of Schena et al. (US Pat. 6,314,457) ("Schena").

Independent claims 18 and 25 have been amended to more clearly define the combination that constitutes the invention of the present application. More particularly, independent claim 18 has been amended to affirmatively claim those elements previously recited in the preamble and include those elements in the combination that constitutes the invention. These elements from the preamble are recited in the amended claim 18 as follows:

"A security validation system adapted to employ a PC comprising: a hand held electronic reference product, an encrypted database file and a file system on said hand held electronic reference product, a reader on the PC,..."

Furthermore, amended claim 18 recites the PC accessing the encrypted data database on the electronic hand held reference product wherein

"said database file is accessed using said file system of the hand held electronic reference product, precluding use of the file system on the PC, while said hand held electronic reference product is connected to said PC and thereby said file system maintaining control over the transmission of said database file".

Independent claim 25 has been similarly amended. Support for these amendment is set forth at least on page 9, lines 8-10 and page 10, lines 3-12 and page 12, lines 1-4 and 15-18 and page 13, lines 6-10. This use of the hand held electronic reference product's file system in conjunction with a first and second voucher and a PC reader as recited in claims 18 and 25

provide for the necessary security to provide a user access to an encrypted database on a hand held electronic reference product through a monitor, keyboard and mouse on an external PC while controlling the unauthorized distribution of that database.

It is submitted that neither Mankoff, Cronce nor Schena, nor the combination thereof, disclose or suggest the features recited in amended claims 18 and 25. Specifically, none of the cited references disclose a hand held electronic reference product connected to a PC wherein an encrypted database file stored on the hand held product is accessed using the file system on the hand held product, precluding use of the file system on the PC, while providing for the decryption and display on the PC of information within the database file.

As shown in Fig. 2, Mankoff discloses synchronization of data between a PC 10 and a personal digital assistant 15 over a communications network 21. The data represents electronic coupons and accompanying information downloaded over the Internet and stored on the PC. However, as more completely discussed in our prior Amendment of June 5, 2009, Mankoff is silent as to using the file system of a personal digital assistant, rather than the file system of a PC, to sync electronic coupons and accompanying information from the PC onto the personal digital assistant. Hence, Mankoff does not disclose the limitation of accessing the encrypted database using the file system of the hand held electronic reference product as recited in amended claims 18 and 25.

As shown in Fig. 1, Cronce discloses a host system 110 accessing authorization information 171 on a portable authorization device 140 connected to the host system 110 prior to providing access to protected information 115 on the host system 110. As noted by the Examiner, the objectives of Cronce are (1) to provide an authorization device for authorizing the

use of protected information that can be updated with new authorization information and yet is removably coupled to the host device, readily portable and relatively inexpensive, (2) to provide a portable authorization device that can receive and store authorization information from multiple types of information authorities and (3) to provide a portable authorization device that offers a high level of security to prevent unauthorized access to the authorization information when stored or transmitted. However, Cronic does not disclose achieving these objection through the limitation that either the protected information on the host system or the authorization information on the portable authorization device are accessed using the file system on the portable authorization device as to preclude the use of the file system on the host system. As such, Cronic does not disclose the extra layer of security provided by the present invention of authorizing the actual file system used to access either the protected information on the host system or the authorization information on the portable authorization device. Hence, Cronic does not disclose the limitation of accessing the encrypted database using the file system of the hand held electronic reference product as recited in amended claims 18 and 25

As shown in Fig. 1, Schena discloses a portal server 200 connected via a network to a scanner 100 and a receiver 80 (or customer premises equipment 300 including a receiver), the portal server 200 allowing advertisers, print media owners and information providers to have a single common database of links for print and electronic. However, as discussed more completely in our prior Amendment of June 5, 2009, Schena is silent as to both a database residing on a remote device connected to the portal server and as to accessing that database using the file system on the remote device, rather than the file system on the portal server, while connected to the portal server. Hence, Schena does not disclose the limitation of accessing the

encrypted database using the file system of the hand held electronic reference product as recited in amended claims 18 and 25.


### **Summary**

The Examiner, presumably has recognized that Mankoff and Schena do not disclose or suggest using the file system of the hand held product for accessing on a PC the encrypted database file stored on the hand held product. The Examiner suggests that Cronic provides that teaching. However, as indicated in more detail in the argument above, Cronic provides functions including an authorization device that does not involve or teach the use of the file system of the portable authorization device on the host system.

In Applicants' opinion, Cronic adds nothing significant to the other two references. Accordingly, the combination which is now positively claimed by Applicants is not obvious over the teachings of the art and allowance is respectfully requested. Specifically, Applicants' amended independent claims 8 and 25 each recite using the file system for a hand held product to enable the host PC to access the encrypted database file from the hand held reference product. This provides for the decryption and display on the host PC of information within the database file.

Dated: 14 Dec 2008

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lloyd McAulay  
Attorney For Applicants  
Reg. No. 20,423

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-6799  
(212) 790-9200  
Fax No. (212) 575-0671  
Email: lmc@cll.com